

Democratic leader talk about how their home States are promoting voter suppression.

The fact of the matter is, Georgia's new election law is squarely in the mainstream when it comes to State election laws. The Georgia bill would likely have been barely a blip in the news cycle if the Democrats had not seen an opportunity to distort this bill to advance their electoral agenda. Yet I want to talk about the actual substance of the Democrats' bill and why every Member of Congress should be opposing it.

We are supposed to believe that this is an election integrity bill. In fact, it is the complete opposite. This bill would undermine election integrity in this country. It would do everything from making our election system more susceptible to fraud to undermining voter faith in our electoral system by politicizing election law.

Let me just highlight a handful of the bill's worst provisions. Note that multiple amendments to address these concerns were voted down by the Democrats at Tuesday's markup, which says a lot about the partisan nature of the Democrats' aims with this bill.

First, this bill would make the Federal Election Commission into a partisan body. Let me just repeat that. This bill would make the Federal Election Commission—the primary enforcer of election law in this country—into a partisan body. Instead of an independent Commission, evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans, which is what it is today, the FEC would become just a partisan arm of whichever President is in power.

Tell me how that is supposed to enhance voter confidence in our system. Every single FEC ruling would be suspect. No Democrat voter would trust a Republican FEC, and no Republican voter would trust a Democrat one.

Speaking of trust, let's talk about election fraud.

The bill takes aim at State voter ID laws, which are commonsense measures—strongly supported by the American people—to ensure that voters are who they say they are before they vote. The Pew Research Center reports that 76 percent of Americans, including 61 percent of Democrats, support voter ID requirements.

Now, I have always been at a loss to understand the congressional Democrats' passionate opposition to requiring people to provide identification before voting. I haven't heard the Democrats spend a lot of time complaining about requiring people to have a photo ID to drive or to fly or to go on a tour at the White House, but, somehow, asking people to provide an ID to vote is beyond the pale.

Great Britain is actually planning to implement a voter ID requirement to prevent—you guessed it—electoral fraud. In fact, many European countries, including France, the Netherlands, and Sweden, require a form of identification to vote. Canada requires

a form of identification to vote. It is difficult to understand the Democrats' fierce opposition to this commonsense fraud prevention measure.

While we are on the subject of electoral fraud, let's talk about ballot harvesting.

In addition to effectively eliminating States' voter ID requirements, S. 1 would also require that States allow ballot harvesting, the controversial practice of allowing political operatives to collect and submit ballots. Needless to say, ballot harvesting opens up a lot of questions about voter fraud and election integrity, and that is to put it mildly. Yet the Democrats' bill would not just permit States to allow it; it would require them—require them—to allow it. I could go on and on and on.

S. 1 would allow the unprecedented regulation of political speech and issue advocacy. It would impose disclosure requirements for organizations, which would open up donors to retaliation and intimidation. It would spend taxpayer dollars—possibly tens of millions of taxpayer dollars per candidate—on the public financing of political campaigns.

That is right. With a soaring national debt and priorities like infrastructure to fund, the Federal Government would end up steering hundreds of millions of dollars to political campaigns. Perhaps the best illustration of that is Senator CRUZ, here in the U.S. Senate, who pointed out that in the first quarter of this year under this law, the Federal Government would have had to cut him a check for \$30 million for his campaign.

This legislation is not about voter integrity. It is not about preventing voter suppression. It is about permanently changing the electoral playing field to give Democrats a permanent electoral advantage.

It is the same reason Democrats want to pack the Supreme Court or admit DC as a State. Democrats want to use whatever political power they have to secure a permanent advantage for Democrat candidates and Democrat policies.

If Democrats were serious about protecting the integrity of our election system, they would be working with Republicans to develop bipartisan legislation, not pushing a bill that is unlikely to get a single Republican vote.

Passing a huge Federal election reform measure on a partisan basis would completely undermine one of the main purposes of election reform legislation, which is enhancing confidence in the integrity of our system.

I can assure Democrats that S. 1 would do nothing to enhance Republican voters' confidence in the integrity of elections. I suspect there are a number of Democrat voters and Independent voters who will also see this bill for what it is—a partisan takeover of our electoral system.

We are fortunate that our electoral system by and large seems to be oper-

ating well. As I mentioned, see the record turnout of voters in the 2020 election. It was the highest turnout since 1900.

But there are certainly measures we can take up to further enhance election integrity—not S. 1, which would do nothing to further election integrity, but there are other measures we could take up. But in order to have any degree of legitimacy, any election reform measures we consider should be taken up on a bipartisan basis, and if Democrats really wanted to enhance voter confidence and protect the integrity of our system, that is what they would be doing—taking up bipartisan legislation on a bipartisan basis.

It is unfortunate that their aims are more partisan than public-spirited. S. 1 is a solution in search of a problem that would result in the unprecedented politicization of our electoral system. For the good of the country, every Member of Congress should oppose it.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON MCREYNOLDS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the McReynolds nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 59, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Ex.]

#### YEAS—59

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Capito	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Lujan	Sinema
Carper	Markey	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Collins	Merkley	Sullivan
Coons	Moran	Tester
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Ernst	Murray	Warnock
Feinstein	Ossoff	Warren
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Graham	Peters	Wyden
Grassley	Portman	

#### NAYS—38

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeben	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Cramer	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Young
Fischer	Paul	

## NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth Heinrich Manchin

Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warnock

Warren  
Whitehouse  
Wicker

Wyden  
Young

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

## NAYS—7

Barrasso  
Cotton  
Cruz

Hawley  
Scott (FL)  
Shelby

Tuberville

## NOT VOTING—4

Heinrich  
Lummis

Manchin  
Thune

The nomination was confirmed.  
(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Nevada.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:47 p.m., recessed until 1:46 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Donet Dominic Graves, Jr., of Ohio, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Graves nomination?

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. BLUNT. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Ex.]

## YEAS—89

Baldwin	Fischer	Murkowski
Bennet	Gillibrand	Murphy
Blackburn	Graham	Murray
Blumenthal	Grassley	Ossoff
Blunt	Hagerty	Padilla
Booker	Hassan	Paul
Boozman	Hickenlooper	Peters
Braun	Hirono	Portman
Brown	Hoeven	Reed
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Risch
Cantwell	Inhofe	Romney
Capito	Johnson	Rosen
Cardin	Kaine	Rounds
Carper	Kelly	Rubio
Casey	Kennedy	Sanders
Cassidy	King	Sasse
Collins	Klobuchar	Schatz
Coons	Lankford	Schumer
Cornyn	Leahy	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	Lee	Shaheen
Cramer	Lujan	Sinema
Crapo	Markey	Smith
Daines	Marshall	Stabenow
Duckworth	McConnell	Sullivan
Durbin	Menendez	Tester
Ernst	Merkley	Tillis
Feinstein	Moran	Toomey

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT  
AGREEMENT—S. 1260

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to file cloture on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENDLESS FRONTIER ACT—MOTION  
TO PROCEED

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, a bill to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strategy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 58, S. 1260, a bill to establish a new Directorate for Technology and Innovation in the National Science Foundation, to establish a regional technology hub program, to require a strat-

egy and report on economic security, science, research, innovation, manufacturing, and job creation, to establish a critical supply chain resiliency program, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, John W. Hickenlooper, Michael F. Bennet, Patty Murray, Tammy Baldwin, Raphael G. Warnock, Christopher Murphy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jacky Rosen, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Jeff Merkley, Gary C. Peters, Catherine Cortez Masto

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

## ECONOMY

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor to talk about the economy, what is going on, on the jobs front, and where we go from here.

Last week, the Department of Labor issued its most recent jobs report. It showed that we added 266,000 jobs in April. That was about one quarter of what was predicted. It was disappointing. It shows that the job growth coming out of the pandemic has now slowed. There is a question as to why, since there are so many jobs out there. How is it that there can be so many jobs available, and yet we have such a disappointing April jobs report? The demand for workers is certainly high.

The other thing going on out there is that we have creeping inflation. We learned this past week that the Consumer Price Index rose 4.2 percent between April 2020 and April 2021. So the year, April to April, is the highest 12-month increase going back to the summer of 2008.

There is this whole debate going on about whether there is inflation or not. Well, I would ask you to talk to your constituents because they will tell you there is inflation. There is inflation at the gas pump; there is inflation at the grocery store; there is inflation if you are trying to build something. There is inflation throughout the economy right now, and that should concern every American. It is because of policy choices, but it doesn't have to be this way.

What this argument boils down to with regard to jobs and with regard to inflation are really two very different approaches and philosophies of government and how to create jobs, how to increase wages, and how to help working families.

The Biden administration believes the government needs to spend more to prime the pump. This is despite our being told by every economic analysis, including our own nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, that without any new stimulus at the beginning of this year, we were going to see the economy come back strongly. In fact, all of the studies showed that the rate of growth this year was going to be 4 percent or more without any stimulus, without any new spending, and that, by